

we shall however content ourselves with
genera of *Zanopetala* since published
and the correction of important errors,
not having time or space for minor
details. We shall want however to refer
to your Californian labours and I hope
that you will let us have what you
have printed early in January that we
may quote page etc. for all *Zanopetala*.
we shall not meddle with vol 1.

I will examine the catalogue you
read and report - it does not look
at all formidable,

Yours very truly

George Deaneham

25, WILTON PLACE.
S.W.

Nov 27/75

My dear Gray

Just received yours of the 15th
and I have also one or two previous
ones of yours unanswered but I have
been overwhelmed with beauties
and am in danger of the printer
treading on my heels so that I have
little time for writing.

As to *Acridia* I have ^{pointed out} admitted
its close alliance to *Drythraea* but I scarcely
think it necessary to unite it with that
genus as Englemann proposes - but that
is matter of taste and in a work like
Gen. St. I am unwilling to go against
special monographs unless I see strong
reasons for disagreeing with them - I
return you Englemann's notes as per done
In revising *Convolvulaceae* I found
it necessary to keep up *Calystegia* not so much
for the bracts which occur in a few species,

and others but on account of the flattened
stigmata at least as different from those of
Convolvulus as they are in Jaegermuntia - the
two genera closely connecting Convolvulus
with Eponsea and passing into both - but
it will never do nowadays to unite large
genera on account of a few intermediate
species for that would oblige us to reunite
the whole series from River to Polymeria.

As to *Leanthaceum* they were almost
enough to drive me distracted - I sent them
however at last to the printer the day before
yesterday - 120 genera including of course
several which I have had to take up & send
though I have examined every large
proportion of them I have been obliged to
omit some evidently used for want of
satisfactory specimens - amongst others
Shearbrechia n. 722 (of which I return you the
flower & seed only sent). We have a good
specimen from you but which cannot be
cut up without spoiling it - It has evidently
the flower & stamens of *Jaerobinia* (*Cyrtanthus*)
with the involucre of some (but not all) species
of *Mancheia* (*Amphipogon*) - I do not like therefore
to make a genus up without without seeing
specimens in bed and in fruit then advanced

stages - more especially as the involucre is
very variable in *Mancheia* and in one species
at least is reduced to ordinary bracts.

Toreyi *Menandrium* with which you
associate *Berynia* is a true *Menandrium*
in habit and character - *Berynia* I must
keep up as distinct.

The genus which includes *Cyrtanthus*
Sericographis etc must take the name of
Jaerobinia as being a year older than the
other

Lobelia floribunda is identical with
Sericographis pauciflora

I sent you off this morning three
sheets down to n. 948 in the middle of *Crophi-*
larina

I have just done *Myoporum* and
Palazina which are not comfortably
associated with *Metbenaea* the superior
micrograph and radicle is an essential distinction
which approximates them to *Crophi-*
Selys differs scarcely more from *Mancheia*
than *Toreyi* from *Euphorbia*

I now go to *Metbenaea* where the way
is already much cleared before me and
Sabatia will be little more than a revision
then I must move up *Addenda et Corrigenda*